

*ma-kuš* appears as *ma-su*<sup>13</sup>). The statement implied that king Darius II originally was called Umakuš (Babylonian *ma-kuš*), is in accordance with the Graeco-Latin evidence for Ochus quoted in § 2.2, since both forms normally<sup>14</sup> reflect one and the same Old Persian original (this being unattested, however), although the Babylonian and the Greek renderings cannot be explained completely<sup>15</sup>.

3.3. That Artaxerxes II originally was named Arses is established by a considerable number of those Late Babylonian astronomical texts, which contain dates for the years 18 to 43 of his reign (387/6 to 362/1 B.C.) and are collected by Sachs 1977, pp. 132–139. The formula employed therein is *ar-šu ša ar-tak-šat-su LUGAL MU-šu SA<sub>4</sub>-u* “Aršu called Artakšatsu the king”: LBAT 1394<sup>16</sup>, rev. 9’–11’; LBAT 167 + 639 + 670, obv. 1 (partly restored)<sup>17</sup>; LBAT 171, col. (item)<sup>18</sup>; LBAT 175, rev. 3’ and upper edge (item)<sup>19</sup>; LBAT 177 + BM 32511, obv. 1 (item)<sup>20</sup>. The

<sup>13</sup> The last sign of that name – SU – in Late Babylonian texts has the values of both *kuš* and *su* (for this special case see, e.g., Weissbach 1911, p. 156), the first of which may be preferred here since the reading in that case seems to be nearer to the Iranian primary form. About the problems concerning, on the contrary, the difference between “*ma-su*” and *Ωχος* and their common basis, which seemed to him “hard to explain”, see Badian 1977, p. 49 n. 20.

<sup>14</sup> The same proportion will be found again in connexion with Artaxerxes III (cf. § 3.4 below).

<sup>15</sup> Wrong are, in the present writer’s opinion at least, the explanations given by Gershevitch *apud* Zadok 1976, p. 70. – It is tempting to trace *ma-kuš* back to an Iranian (not OP) form *\*Vahuš*. But in this case there are to be answered in the first line the questions whether there are in fact any unquestionable renderings of Iranian /h/ by Late Babylonian <k> and whether Greek *Ωχος*, contrary to the traditional view (which thinks of an identity with OP *\*Vauka*, being the equivalent to *Vahuka*, which cannot be the genuine OP form though it is attested in an OP inscription), may be traced back also to such an original, in other words: whether Greek ω and χ may reflect Iranian /va/ and /h/ respectively, too?

<sup>16</sup> For the text of this planetary table with Jupiter observations for the years 387/6 to 346/5 B.C. see the previous study by Kugler 1907, pp. 82/83 (with plate IV); in the meantime this fragment LBAT 1394 (older registration number: Sp. II 901) has been joined with LBAT 1395, 1399, and 1400 by Sachs before and since the publication of Pinches 1955 (cf. Pinches 1955, p. xxix; Sachs 1977, p. 133).

<sup>17</sup> These fragments of an astronomical diary for 382/1 B.C. seemingly have been joined only after the publication of Pinches 1955.

<sup>18</sup> This fragmentary astronomical diary for 379/8 B.C. was previously published by Kugler 1907, pp. 76/77 (with plate III).

<sup>19</sup> This piece belongs to an astronomical diary for 373/2 B.C. and may be combined with the set LBAT 177 *et al.* according to Pinches 1955, p. xxi; cf. note 20 below.

<sup>20</sup> These two fragments of an astronomical diary are joined by Sachs 1977, p. 137 only after the publication of Pinches 1955 and are probably from the same tablet as LBAT 175; cf. note 19 above.

variant writing of the throne-name with initial *ar-tak* is to be found in LBAT 174 + 580 + 731, col. (partly restored)<sup>21</sup>; LBAT 186, lower edge (item)<sup>22</sup>; LBAT 183 + 184 + 185 + BM 32149, col. and upper edge and left edge (item)<sup>23</sup>. The reading really given in LBAT 187, obv. 1 and col. (partly restored)<sup>24</sup>, the last text to be cited here, cannot be ascertained at present, since the text is yet unpublished and the quotation in Sachs 1977, p. 139 (as it is at several other times) inconsistent and unreliable as to the diacritics. That whole Late Babylonian evidence is of importance with regard to the varying Greek forms of the king’s original name; this question, however, will be treated in § 4.1 below.

3.4. The original name of king Artaxerxes III likewise is attested in a number of Late Babylonian texts from the years 12 to 20 of his reign (347/6 to 339/8 B.C.) – see Sachs 1977, pp. 138–143 –, among them a chronicle of that king preserved on a tablet from Babylon. The formula used in these texts is, in full analogy to the other ones, either *ma-kuš* (not: *ma-su*)<sup>25</sup> *ar-tak-šat-su [MU-šu] SA<sub>4</sub>-u* “Umakuš called Artakšatsu” in ABC 9,1–2<sup>26</sup> or *ma-kuš ša ar-tak-šat-su LUGAL MU-šu na-bu-u* (or: *SA<sub>4</sub>-u*) “Umakuš called Artakšatsu the king” in LBAT 189, upper and lower and left edge, rev. 25, obv. 1 (partly restored)<sup>27</sup>; LBAT 1394<sup>28</sup>, rev. 12’–13’; LBAT 190 + BM 77245, obv. 1 (partly restored)<sup>29</sup>; LBAT 192, col. (item)<sup>30</sup> and finally in the new fragment BM

<sup>21</sup> The fragment of an astronomical diary for 376/5 B.C. (LBAT 174), which has been joined with the other two fragments after 1955, but itself is decisive for the problem concerned here, seems to be unpublished till now.

<sup>22</sup> That text is a fragment of an astronomical diary for 367/6 B.C. and forms obviously a duplicate of the set LBAT 183 *et al.* (cf. note 23 below).

<sup>23</sup> These unpublished fragments of an astronomical diary for 367/6 B.C. (cf. note 22 above) have been joined by Pinches 1955, p. xiii and Sachs 1977, p. 137 respectively. In the last-mentioned passage the royal title (LUGAL) seemingly is missing.

<sup>24</sup> This text is an astronomical diary for 362/1 B.C.

<sup>25</sup> For this reading see note 13 above; it was this very chronicle text for which Weissbach 1911, p. 156 had suggested his proposal for the new reading, – though without success.

<sup>26</sup> This quotation refers to Grayson 1975, p. 114 no. 9 (BM 31450), where that is commented only by the words: “Some Achaemenid kings had two names and the phrase indicating this was: PN<sub>1</sub> ša PN<sub>2</sub> šumšu nabū”.

<sup>27</sup> This unpublished text is an astronomical diary for 347/6 B.C.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. § 3.3 with notes 16 and 17 above; the text is pertinent here since the date given (year 13 of Umakuš/Artakšatsu) refers to the latest one of the Jupiter observations registered there.

<sup>29</sup> The fragment LBAT 190 of an astronomical diary for 343/2 B.C. has recently been joined with BM 77245 by Sachs 1977, p. 141.

<sup>30</sup> Unpublished fragment of an astronomical diary for 339/8 B.C.